

**The University of Washington
Faculty Council on Educational Technology**

The Faculty Council on Educational Technology met **Tuesday December 12, 2000** at 10:00 a.m. in 36 Gerberding. Chair William Zoller presided.

PRESENT: *Faculty* DeYoung, Diaz, Mizokawa, Zoller. *Ex officio* *Beach, *Jordan. *Special Guests* Scott Macklin and Nana Lowell.

ABSENT: *Faculty* Aldea, Leggott, Liu, Porter, Riley and Sarikaya. *Ex officio* Bjorkstam, Schmitt and Szatmary. *Regular guest* Tom Lewis.

Minutes from November 14, 2000 were approved as written.

Discussion of Faculty Technology Survey

The council discussed the best approaches to advertising the upcoming Faculty Technology Survey and decided that Chair Zoller should devote much of his pending U-Week to the importance of the survey. Other council members suggested sending memos to the Deans of all the Colleges, asking them to email faculty regarding the survey. Macklin said the survey team planned to do intensive follow-up on the survey with emails, hard-copy mailings, phone calls, and possibly personal visits to departments. The survey will also be signed by President McCormick and Lee Huntsman and will be endorsed by FCET, CIDR, and PETT among others.

Several council members asked what will motivate faculty to fill out the survey. Macklin responded that there will be a direct relationship between the survey results and an improvement in the following areas: better technical support services, assistance with faculty use of in-class technology, and more tailored help for faculty technology users in general. Diaz asserted that faculty need to be involved in how the money for technology use on campus is spent. It needs to be made clear to faculty that this survey will relay their voices to the administration and could have a profound impact on how tech dollars are spent. Macklin and Lowell also informed the council that the survey would include certain incentives such as a raffle for a Palm Pilot or laptop as well as giveaways like Starbucks coupons.

Macklin and Lowell asked council members to review the survey carefully for questions that might be deemed too personal or that faculty might otherwise find insensitive. Lowell explained that faculty councils are crucial to the survey's success since they provide invaluable feedback on how faculty perceive and respond to certain questions. Lowell also noted that numerous faculty were working on Human Subject Review Guidelines. One suggestion faculty have already made is to include an option to have one's name removed from the survey list by checking a comment box that reads, "I do not wish to be surveyed, please take me off your mailing list." Lowell said that range of responses to these surveys is enormous: from irate to apologetic and all points in between.

Beach asked if it were possible to build a website that shows the survey responses as they come in. Lowell replied that the survey team had considered this but decided they did not want previous responses to affect the way future people respond. Beach pointed out that perhaps only the number of faculty who responded could be posted on the web site so as not to corrupt the data set. Other council members asked whether faculty who completed the survey online would also receive a mailer. Lowell replied that they were still working on whether to do a mailer to all faculty, or whether to prevent those who fill out online surveys from getting mailers. Zoller suggested not sending mailers to faculty who fill out the survey online.

Other council members suggested having the Deans send one email to faculty, then scratch all other emails from the survey team. Macklin and Lowell observed that this might leave room for error and the survey team does not wish to place the burden of sending out the survey emails on departmental chairs. Zoller reminded the council that he will be writing an article for the January 11 edition of University Week in which he will advertise the upcoming technology use survey. He asked Macklin and Lowell if they would like to participate in writing the article. Both agreed they would be glad to help.

Diaz asked how much tech money there was to be distributed across campus. Several council members were concerned that the administration does not consult with faculty when it comes to how these funds are spent. Zoller agreed that faculty need to be included in meetings where these types of financial decisions are made.

Macklin advised that the survey committee is looking for faculty to pre-test the survey and asked for volunteers from the council. He asked for two volunteers: one an "early adaptor" and the other perhaps a more "reluctant adaptor." Any interested council members should contact Macklin by Friday December 15 either by email (smacklin@u) or via campus mail at Box 353080. One council member pointed out that Question 7 of the draft survey defined the academic year as autumn through summer; it should be autumn through spring. Macklin and Lowell observed that these are exactly the kinds of things faculty can do to improve the quality of the survey. Zoller suggested sending an electronic copy of the survey to all FCET members.

Several members wondered about incentives for filling out the survey: what are the barriers to faculty filling out the survey? Lowell said the survey team was trying to make the process as easy as possible by offering faculty options for filling out the survey either online or in hardcopy. They have scrutinized the survey to a minute level of detail, down to how easy it is to fold and place in an envelope in an attempt to remove as many barriers as possible. The survey team has also kept the length of the survey to a minimum because studies have shown that the more pages you have, the lower the response rate will be. Lowell added that the survey team is also doing phone follow ups on a randomly-selected group of several hundred faculty. FCET members suggested polling their individual departments to see if their colleagues had responded to the survey.

Beach suggested affixing a mailing label to the survey that contained all the demographic information for the respondent. This would save space on the survey by replacing demographic questions and would save respondents' time by preventing them from having to fill out the information in the survey. Lowell said the committee had looked into doing something like this but had decided against it based on past experiences with paste-on labels and windowed envelopes.

Beach also suggested handling the survey the way student grade sheets or the Unified Fund Drive (UFD) are handled--with the demographic labels attached. If the survey team used one of these existing infrastructures, wouldn't it save time and money? Lowell pointed out that UFD mailers *are* pre-labeled but are sent to departments in bundles; her office has had bad experiences with asking departments to distribute surveys.

Finally, the council wanted to know what policy changes would go into effect as a result of the survey. Lowell responded that they did not know this yet. *The Chair asked if he, Diaz, DeYoung, Macklin, and Lowell could meet in his office on December 14 @ 1:00pm to discuss the U-Week article Zoller needs to write.*

Meeting adjourned at 11:05. Minutes by Todd Reid, Recorder.